
Subject: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP

Posted by [Dedric Terry](#) on Wed, 28 Nov 2007 23:10:07 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

This is a multi-part message in MIME format.

-----=_NextPart_000_00B0_01C831D9.2514E610

Content-Type: text/plain;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

A Nuendo 4 Mac user recently posted some test results on OSX vs. XP on = the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):

On the Mac he put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage) and EQs on = all channels for up to 32 channels and the cpu was at 90% with stutters and slow GUI response at 1024 sample = buffers. (N4 is now 64-bit for OSX).

On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no glitches = and smooth response. He dropped latency to 512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and playback.

Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing at all - purely a real world = technical comparison. I've always been interested in a head to head of = operating systems. Also take it for what its' worth until more tests = come in.

At the moment, from all of the tests I've seen, it looks like XP can = handle the highest load/cpu utilization of Vista, XP and OSX. No way of knowing where Linux would compare.

Just an interesting fyi. It's not a huge difference, but even at 5-6% = increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista. For some users it may be worth noting - esp. GUI responsiveness - for = others, not a big deal.

I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I figured OSX = and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =20

Regards,
Dedric

-----=_NextPart_000_00B0_01C831D9.2514E610

Content-Type: text/html;

charset="iso-8859-1"

Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable

```

<!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
<HTML><HEAD>
<META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
charset=3Diso-8859-1">
<META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16546" name=3DGENERATOR>
<STYLE></STYLE>
</HEAD>
<BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>A Nuendo 4&nbsp;Mac user recently =
posted some test=20
results on OSX vs. XP on the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):<BR><BR>On =
the Mac he=20
put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage)&nbsp;and EQs on all =
channels for up=20
to 32 channels and</FONT></DIV>
<DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>the cpu was at 90% with stutters and =
slow GUI=20
response at 1024 sample buffers.&nbsp;(N4 is now 64-bit for=20
OSX).</FONT></DIV><FONT face=3DArial size=3D2>
<DIV><BR>On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no =
glitches=20
and smooth response.&nbsp;He dropped latency to</DIV>
<DIV>512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and=20
playback.</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing&nbsp;at all - purely&nbsp;a =
real=20
world technical comparison.&nbsp;I've always been interested in a head =
to head=20
of operating systems.&nbsp;Also take it for what its' worth until more =
tests=20
come in.</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>At the moment, from&nbsp;all of the tests I've seen, it looks like=20
XP&nbsp;can handle the highest load/cpu utilization&nbsp;of Vista, XP =
and=20
OSX.</DIV>
<DIV>No way of knowing where Linux would compare.</DIV>
<DIV>&nbsp;</DIV>
<DIV>Just an interesting fyi.&nbsp;It's not a huge difference, but even =
at 5-6%=20
increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista.</DIV>
<DIV>For some users&nbsp;it may be&nbsp;worth noting&nbsp;- esp. GUI=20
responsiveness - for others, not a big deal.</DIV>
<DIV><BR>I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I =
figured OSX=20
and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra</DIV>

```

<DIV>graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =

</DIV><FONT=20

face=3DArial size=3D2>

<DIV>
Regards,</DIV>

<DIV>Dedric
</DIV></BODY></HTML>

-----=_NextPart_000_00B0_01C831D9.2514E610--

Subject: Re: Nuendo on OSX vs. XP

Posted by [TCB](#) on Thu, 29 Nov 2007 00:42:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

It's a micro/mach kernel vs. monolithic kernel issue. It's never going to change. In theory you get a stability bump, and there are some systems with staggering stability records. The effin FILE SYSTEM can be restarted without a reboot with a true microkernel. But you pay a penalty with low latency applications and some file system issues.

My guess is GNU/Linux could do a little better than XP if the software were really done right. But probably less than the penalty paid with a microkernel. A couple of percent, tops.

Vista is the worst of both worlds! Monolithic kernel panics with so much DRM and poorly implemented security that you get the instability of a monolithic kernel with the performance hit of micro/mach! Leave it to Redmond to manage that.

It's XP for audio and Debian for everything else in my world.

TCB

"Dedric Terry" <dterry@keyofd.net> wrote:

>

>

>A Nuendo 4 Mac user recently posted some test results on OSX vs. XP on =

>the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):

>

>On the Mac he put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage) and EQs on =

>all channels for up to 32 channels and

>the cpu was at 90% with stutters and slow GUI response at 1024 sample =

>buffers. (N4 is now 64-bit for OSX).

>

>On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no glitches =

>and smooth response. He dropped latency to

>512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and playback.

>

>Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing at all - purely a real world =

>technical comparison. I've always been interested in a head to head of
 =
 >operating systems. Also take it for what its' worth until more tests =
 >come in.
 >
 >At the moment, from all of the tests I've seen, it looks like XP can =
 >handle the highest load/cpu utilization of Vista, XP and OSX.
 >No way of knowing where Linux would compare.
 >
 >Just an interesting fyi. It's not a huge difference, but even at 5-6% =
 >increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista.
 >For some users it may be worth noting - esp. GUI responsiveness - for =
 >others, not a big deal.
 >
 >I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I figured OSX =
 >and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra
 >graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =20
 >
 >Regards,
 >Dedric
 >
 >
 ><!DOCTYPE HTML PUBLIC "-//W3C//DTD HTML 4.0 Transitional//EN">
 ><HTML><HEAD>
 ><META http-equiv=3DContent-Type content=3D"text/html; =
 >charset=3Diso-8859-1">
 ><META content=3D"MSHTML 6.00.6000.16546" name=3DGENERATOR>
 ><STYLE></STYLE>
 ></HEAD>
 ><BODY bgColor=3D#ffffff>
 ><DIV>A Nuendo 4 Mac user recently =
 >posted some test=20
 >results on OSX vs. XP on the same MacPro (2.66Ghz, 3G Ram):

On =
 >the Mac he=20
 >put Nuendo multiband comps (heavy cpu usage) and EQs on all =
 >channels for up=20
 >to 32 channels and</DIV>
 ><DIV>the cpu was at 90% with stutters and =
 >slow GUI=20
 >response at 1024 sample buffers. (N4 is now 64-bit for=20
 >OSX).</DIV>
 ><DIV>
On the WinXP partition, same project ran 85% at 1024 with no =
 >glitches=20
 >and smooth response. He dropped latency to</DIV>
 ><DIV>512 samples and cpu went to 90% but still smooth response and=20
 >playback.</DIV>
 ><DIV> </DIV>
 ><DIV>Not trying to start a Mac vs. PC thing at all - purely a =

>real=20
>world technical comparison. I've always been interested in a head =
>to head=20
>of operating systems. Also take it for what its' worth until more =
>tests=20
>come in.</DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><DIV>At the moment, from all of the tests I've seen, it looks like=20
>XP can handle the highest load/cpu utilization of Vista, XP =
>and=20
>OSX.</DIV>
><DIV>No way of knowing where Linux would compare.</DIV>
><DIV> </DIV>
><DIV>Just an interesting fyi. It's not a huge difference, but even =
>at 5-6%=20
>increase it's more than the difference between XP and Vista.</DIV>
><DIV>For some users it may be worth noting - esp. GUI=20
>responsiveness - for others, not a big deal.</DIV>
><DIV>
I was actually hoping there would be no difference, but I =
>figured OSX=20
>and Vista would be closer in performance due to the extra</DIV>
><DIV>graphics overhead and integrated tools/apps. =
></DIV><FONT=20
>face=3DArial size=3D2>
><DIV>
Regards,</DIV>
><DIV>Dedric
</DIV></BODY></HTML>
>
>
